UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,723	01/26/2004	Mikko P. Inkinen	944-005.028	2538

4955 7590 06/11/2007

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
LEE, WILSON	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,723	INKINEN, MIKKO P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wilson Lee	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague because it is a single means claim. Kindly note that anything after the terms "for" and "wherein" is considered as intended use.

Claim 6 is vague because it fails to show what is being the same.

Claim 15 is vague because it is a single means claim. Kindly note that anything after the terms "for" and "wherein" is considered as intended use.

Claim 16 is vague because it indicates that a decoder is the invention in the beginning. But later on, it indicates the file system having an encoder. It is not clear whether the claimed invention refers to the decoder, the file system or the encoder. Does the decoder comprise the encoder? If not, why is it on the first line of the claim?

Claims 2-14 are vague by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 17 is vague whether what the result of the method is producing.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it lacks any useful and tangible results of the method. It must conclude what the method is producing besides the sub routine steps in the body of the claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perrin et al. (2004/0088153).

Regarding Claim 1, Perrin et al. discloses a mobile device (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2) comprising including an operating system having a file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character, wherein the file system comprises an encoder module for encoding the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename and the information for converting back into original format (paragraphs 0004, 0045).

Regarding Claim 2, Perrin discloses that the specific code character inherently includes information about the position of the illegal character in the filename because

the specific code character for replacement of the illegal character will be at the same location of the illegal character (Also see paragraphs 0045, 0051).

Regarding Claim 4, Perrin discloses that the specific code character includes information about the illegal character itself since it can be converted back to original format (See paragraph 0045).

Regarding Claim 6, Perrin discloses that the specific code character includes information to identify the same (e.g. same process manner) from other characters (see paragraphs 0004, 0024, 0040, 0045).

Regarding Claim 8, Perrin discloses that the specific code character is inherently placed in a predefined location in the filename because its location will be the location of illegal character.

Regarding Claim 10, Perrin discloses that the file system further comprises a decoder module (emulation library) for decoding an encoded filename by replacing the specific code character with the illegal character, whereby the filename is decoded back to the original format. (See paragraph 0045).

Regarding Claim 15, Perrin discloses an encoder for a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2), the file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character, wherein the encoder module encodes the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename and the information for converting back into original format. (paragraphs 0004, 0045).

Regarding Claim 16, Perrin discloses a decoder for a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal (wireless network. For instance, laptop PC) (See paragraphs 0024, 0040, fig. 2), the file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character and having an encoder module for encoding the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename and the information for converting back into original format, the decoder (emulation library) for decoding an encoded filename by replacing the specific code character with the illegal character, whereby the filename is decoded back to the original format. (See paragraph 0045).

Regarding Claim 17, Perrin discloses a method comprising encoding a filename having an illegal character by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename and the information for converting back into original format (paragraphs 0004, 0045).

Claim 17, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Underwood (2001/0011221).

Regarding Claim 17, Underwood discloses a method comprising encoding a filename having an illegal character by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename. (paragraphs 0044, 0045, 0068).

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 15, 17, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Butterfield et al. (2004/0177159).

Regarding Claim 1, Butterfield discloses a mobile terminal comprising including an operating system having a file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character, wherein the file system comprises an encoder module for encoding the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename (paragraphs 0048, 0066, claims 7, 18, 24).

Regarding Claim 2, Butterfield discloses that the specific code character inherently includes information about the position of the illegal character in the filename because the specific code character for replacement of the illegal character will be at the same location of the illegal character (Also see paragraphs 0048, claims 7, 18, 24).

Regarding Claim 6, Butterfield discloses that the specific code character includes information to identify the same (e.g. same process manner) from other characters.

Regarding Claim 8, Butterfield discloses that the specific code character is inherently placed in a predefined location in the filename since its location will be the location of invalid character.

Regarding Claim 15, Butterfield discloses an encoder for a file system of an operating system in a mobile terminal, the file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character, wherein the encoder module encodes the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about

the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename. (See paragraphs 0048, 0066, claims 7, 18, 24).

Regarding Claim 17, Butterfield discloses a method comprising encoding a filename having an illegal character by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename. (paragraphs 0048, 0066, claims 7, 18, 24).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrin et al. (2004/0088153) in view of Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map and/or FileFormat.info. All of them are general knowledge accessible online.

Regarding Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as discussed above, Perrin essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not disclose the number of bits (4 bits, 8 bits, 16 bits, etc) of the Unicode character. However, it is well known to a skilled in the art that all characters in data are characterized in bits and Unicode. (See Col. 8, lines 50-67 and *Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map*), it would

have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Perrin would also define the characters of the filenames in bits which depends what characters they are.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterfield et al. (2004/0177159) in view of Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map and/or FileFormat.info. All of them are general knowledge accessible online.

Regarding Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as discussed above, Butterfield essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not disclose the number of bits (4 bits, 8 bits, 16 bits, etc) of the Unicode character. However, it is well known to a skilled in the art that all characters in data are characterized in bits and Unicode. (See Col. 8, lines 50-67 and *Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map*), it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Butterfield would also define the characters of the filenames in bits which depends what characters they are.

Claims 9, 11, 12, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrin et al. (2004/0088153).

Regarding Claim 9, as discussed above, Perrin essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not explicitly disclose the location (end of a main portion) of the filename before a commonly used extension. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art that such location (e.g. the front, middle or end of main portion) of the filename merely depends on where the invalid or illegal character locates. So, if the illegal character locates in the end, then that location will be taken as a placement for

the specific code character. Therefore, Perrin can have the specific code character placed at the end of the main portion of the filename.

Regarding Claim 11, Perrin discloses that the file system receives filenames from a source and stores filenames without corrupting them (paragraphs, 0004, 0051) but Perrin does not explicitly teach that it is external. However, having an external storage means for storing filenames is well known and commonly used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an external storage means for storing additional filenames in order to provide more filenames and portability of the source.

Regarding Claim 12, any storage means including Perrin that converts invalid filenames into valid filenames is inherently a mass storage means since it holds lots of data.

Claims 9, 11, 12, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butterfield et al. (2004/0177159).

Regarding Claim 9, as discussed above, Butterfield essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not explicitly disclose the location (end of a main portion) of the filename before a commonly used extension. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art that such location (e.g. the front, middle or end of main portion) of the filename merely depends on where the invalid or illegal character locates. If the illegal character locates in the end, then that location will be taken as a placement for the specific code character. Therefore, Butterfield can have the specific code character placed at the end of the main portion of the filename.

Regarding Claim 11, Butterfield discloses that the file system receives filenames from a source and stores filenames without corrupting them (paragraph 0051) but Butterfield does not explicitly teach that it is external. However, having an external storage means for storing filenames is well known and commonly used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an external storage means for storing additional filenames in order to provide more filenames and portability of the source.

Regarding Claim 12, any storage means including Butterfield that is inherently a mass storage means since it holds lots of data.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 15, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood (2001/0011221) in view of Perrin et al. (2004/0088153).

Regarding Claim 1, Underwood discloses a device (fig. 1) comprising including an operating system having a file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character, wherein the file system comprises an encoder module for encoding the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename (paragraphs 0044, 0045, 0068).

As discussed above, Underwood essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not explicitly disclose a mobile terminal. However, mobile terminal such as laptop computer is very common nowadays. For example, Perrin discloses that wireless network system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify

the system of Underwood (fig. 1) to a mobile terminal or wireless network in order to render better mobility and portability. Merely arranging the desktop terminal to a mobile terminal does not create novelty and unexpected results.

Regarding Claim 2, Underwood discloses that the specific code character inherently includes information about the position of the illegal character in the filename because the specific code character for replacement of the illegal character will be at the same location of the illegal character

Regarding Claim 6, Underwood discloses that the specific code character includes information to identify the same (e.g. same process manner) from other characters

Regarding Claim 8, Underwood discloses that the specific code character is inherently placed in a predefined location in the filename since its location will be the location of illegal character.

Regarding Claim 9, as discussed above, Underwood essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not explicitly disclose the location (end of a main portion) of the filename before a commonly used extension. However, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art that such location (e.g. the front, middle or end of main portion) of the filename merely depends on where the invalid or illegal character locates. If the illegal character locates in the end, then that location will be taken as a placement for the specific code character. Therefore, Underwood can have the specific code character placed at the end of the main portion of the filename.

Regarding Claim 15, Underwood discloses an encoder for a file system of an operating system (fig. 1), the file system for detecting a filename with an illegal character, wherein the encoder module encodes the filename by replacing the illegal character with a specific code character having information coded therein about the illegal character itself such as the character location in the filename. (paragraphs 0044, 0045, 0068).

As discussed above, Underwood essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not explicitly disclose a mobile terminal. However, mobile terminal such as laptop computer is very common nowadays. For example, Perrin discloses that wireless network system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Underwood (fig. 1) to a mobile terminal or wireless network in order to render better mobility and portability.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood (2001/0011221) in view of Perrin et al. (2004/0088153), further in view of Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map and/or FileFormat.info. All of them are general knowledge accessible online.

Regarding Claims 3, 5, 7, 13, 14, as discussed above, Underwood essentially discloses the claimed invention but does not disclose the number of bits (4 bits, 8 bits, 16 bits, etc) of the Unicode character. However, it is well known to a skilled in the art that all characters in data are characterized in bits and Unicode. (See Col. 8, lines 50-67 and *Mapping of Unicode Characters, Free Online Unicode Character Map*), it would

have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Underwood would also define the characters of the filenames in bits which depends what characters they are.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The finality of the previous office action has been withdrawn due to the most updated search and consideration.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1824. Papers related to the application may be submitted by facsimile transmission. Any transmission not to be considered an official response must be clearly marked "DRAFT". The official fax number is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

6/8/07

WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER